

Hinze, Leo

From: Hinze, Leo
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2005 5:29 PM
To: 'moetteli@email.com'
Cc: Yan, Ren
Subject: RE: 10/813,090 After Final

Tracking:	Recipient	Read
	'moetteli@email.com'	
	Yan, Ren	Read: 8/22/05 9:32 AM

Good Afternoon, Mr. Moetteli.

As a formal matter, would you fax a signed authorization to communicate by email to the official USPTO fax number, 571-273-8300, please? MPEP § 502.03 (II) contains suggested language for this authorization:

The following is a sample authorization form which may be used by applicant:

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Regarding case 10/813,090, and our telephone conversation of Wednesday, it is my position that the final rejection of Claim 9 was proper, and that the Germann and Cushner references were properly combined and applied. The proposed after final amendment and request for consideration, including our telephone conversation, do not overcome the rejections or place the case in better form for appeal, but instead require further consideration, and therefore the proposed amendment will not be entered, and claims 9-18 will stand as finally rejected.

While I appreciate your arguments and understand the differences in the art between the various types of printing such as flexographic and intaglio, and the terms used to describe them and the weight that may be given to them by a person having ordinary skill in the art, it is my position that as finally rejected, there is no limitation in Claim 9 that suggests an intaglio or otherwise non-flexographic printing apparatus. The phrase "ink transporting relief surfaces having limits corresponding to the outlines of surfaces to be inked on the plate cylinder" could reasonably be interpreted as being taught by Cushner, as the term "relief" does not seem to have an unambiguous meaning of the recessed surfaces that remain after cutting, as opposed to the raised surfaces that remain.

I will include the above in my formal interview summary.

Best regards,

Leo Hinze

-----Original Message-----

From: John Moetteli [mailto:moetteli@patentinfo.net]
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2005 2:27 PM
To: Hinze, Leo
Subject: 10/813,090 After Final

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION-- if this message is addressed to you directly by the sender, or in the cc fields, you may read and act on this message. Otherwise, you have no right to read or copy this message. We therefore ask your cooperation in informing the sender of the error in receipt and in deleting this message from all your email folders. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

8/24/05

>>>>Please confirm receipt<<<<

Regarding: Our Ref 1.G164.202Div

Dear Examiner Hinze,

Thank you once again for your and your supervisor's time spent in the interview on this case.

I am following up as you mentioned you would be kind enough and look at this case, discuss it, and repond to us by today.

Please provide your response by email to moetteli@email.com, or call me at 0114179 406 6254.

Best regards,

John Moetteli, Esq.

Moetteli & Associés SàRL

US and International Patent and Trademark Attorneys-at-law St. Leonhardstrasse 4 CH-9000 St. Gallen
SWITZERLAND

Phone1: +41 71 230 1000

Phone2: +41 22 747 7849

Fax1: +41 71 230 1001 (St. Gallen)

Fax2: +41 22 347 7887 (Genève)

Email: moetteli@email.com

Website: www.moetteli.com

Specialists in US Patent, Trademark, and Copyright registrations, including licensing, infringement, invalidity, and enforceability patent opinions involving US patents; software, methods, and biotech patent applications; and patent filing strategy.
